



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/775,603	02/09/2004	Michael E. Anderson	ANSN-101	1627

7590 06/05/2008
Law Offices of Morland C. Fischer
Suite 1300
2030 Main Street
Irvine, CA 92614

EXAMINER	
AGGARWAL, YOGESH K	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2622	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/05/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/775,603

Applicant(s)

ANDERSON, MICHAEL E.

Examiner

YOGESH K. AGGARWAL

Art Unit

2622

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 February 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 13-15 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 16-20 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of specie I associated with Claims 1-12, 16-20 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the subject matter of both groups is sufficiently related that a thorough search for the subject matter of any one specie would encompass a search for the subject matter of the other specie. This is not found persuasive because the non-elected specie contains features, which would not be included in a class/subclass search or text search for the elected group.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Prokosi (US PG-PUB 2001/0033661).

[Claim 1]

Prokosi teaches a method by which photographic images taken by and stored in a digital camera are downloaded to a computer at which the photographic images are located for viewing

(Paragraph 71 and figures 1 and 2), said method comprising the steps of annotating said photographic images by assigning markers to identify different sets of said images according to subject (Paragraph 71, figure 1); downloading said images from the digital camera to the computer (images are transmitted); assigning labels to each of the different sets of images corresponding with the markers assigned thereto; locating said set of images in respective image folders according to said labels; and accessing and viewing a particular set of images located in a particular one of said image folders (Paragraph 72, figure 2, each image file is read as a folder).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prokosi (US PG-PUB 2001/0033661) in view of Walker et al. (US PG-PUB # 2004/0174434).

[Claims 2-4]

Prokosi fails to teach wherein said digital camera includes a mass media storage device adapted to store sound data and the photographic images taken by the camera to be downloaded to the computer, said method comprising the additional step of annotating said photographic images by means of sound markers, locked markers or flat markers spoken into and stored by the mass media storage device. However Walker teaches metadata including sound, sky/grass (flat image or locked image) to be used to annotate the image (Paragraph 119). Therefore taking the combined teachings of Prokosi and Walker, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the

time of the invention to have been motivated to have used annotating said photographic images by means of sound markers, locked markers or flat markers in order to give the user versatility in annotating the image thus making the process user-friendly.

6. Claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prokosi (US PG-PUB 2001/0033661) in view of Aoki et al. (US Patent # 7,069,314).

[Claim 5]

Prokosi fails to teach including the additional step of locating information in at least one additional group of folders corresponding to events or topics associated with the different sets of said photographic images, and accessing and viewing the particular set of image located in a particular one of said image folders depending upon the information located within a particular folder of said additional group of folders. However Aoki teaches an ID file 110 that includes a folder ID that uniquely identifies the OPI folder that contains the high and low resolution images (col. 7 lines 10-63, figure 5 and 6). Therefore taking the combined teachings of Prokosi and Aoki, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to have used locating information in at least one additional group of folders corresponding to events or topics associated with the different sets of said photographic images, and accessing and viewing the particular set of image located in a particular one of said image folders depending upon the information located within a particular folder of said additional group of folders in order to locate the images efficiently and quickly.

[Claim 6]

Art Unit: 2622

Aoki teaches including the additional steps of merging said image folders into said additional group of folders, transferring said merged folders to a computer server folder, and accessing and viewing the particular set of said images at said server folder (col. 7 lines 10-63).

[Claim 7]

Aoki teaches including the additional step of copying the photographic images taken by the camera to create high resolution and low resolution images, downloading the low resolution images to the computer to create said image folders, and accessing and viewing a particular set of said low resolution images located in a particular one of said image folders (col. 7 lines 10-63).

[Claim 8]

Aoki teaches including the additional step of storing said high resolution photographic images in a high resolution storage and transmitting said high resolution images from said storage to a photo lab for processing (col. 1 lines 38-49).

7. Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prokosi (US PG-PUB 2001/0033661) in view of Bryant et al. (US Patent # 7,349,010).

[Claim 9]

Prokosi fails to teach displaying the particular set of images being accessed and viewed as a slide show. However Bryant teaches displaying a particular set of images as a slide show (col. 22 lines 63-66, figure 15). Therefore taking the combined teachings of Prokosi and Bryant, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have particular set of images being accessed and viewed as a slide show in order for the user to view all the images easily by just pressing one button.

[Claim 10]

Bryant teaches a step of displaying an offer to enable one or more of the images from the particular set of images at said slide show to be acquired (figure 16, favorite images).

[Claim 11]

Bryant teaches displaying an order form to be completed by which to enable one or more of the images from the particular set of images at said slide show to be acquired (col. 23 lines 2-4).

8. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prokosi (US PG-PUB 2001/0033661), Bryant et al. (US Patent # 7,349,010) and in further view of Haas et al. (US PG-PUB # 2004/0012810).

[Claim 12]

Prokosi in view of Bryant fails to teach the additional step of initiating a timer by which to limit the time available during which to complete said order form. However Haas teaches ordering an image within three seconds during which to complete ordering the images on a slide show (Paragraph 0036). Therefore taking the combined teachings of Prokosi, Bryant and Haas, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have a timer by which to limit the time available during which to complete said order form in order to let the user order images within a set period of time ensuring a quicker process.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 16-20 are allowed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to YOGESH K. AGGARWAL whose telephone number is (571)272-7360. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00AM-5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lin Ye can be reached on (571)-272-7372. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Yogesh K Aggarwal/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2622